

Identifying data deleted to  
prevent clearly unwarranted  
invasion of personal privacy



U.S. Citizenship  
and Immigration  
Services

D.S.

**PUBLIC COPY**



FILE: [Redacted]  
WAC 06 254 51450

Office: CALIFORNIA SERVICE CENTER

Date: JAN 11 2008

IN RE: Petitioner: [Redacted]  
Beneficiary: [Redacted]

PETITION: Petition for Alien Fiancé(e) Pursuant to Section 101(a)(15)(K) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1101(a)(15)(K)

ON BEHALF OF PETITIONER:

SELF-REPRESENTED

INSTRUCTIONS:

This is the decision in your case. All documents have been returned to the office that originally decided your case. Any further inquiry must be made to that office.

Robert P. Wiemann, Chief  
Administrative Appeals Office

**DISCUSSION:** The nonimmigrant visa petition was denied by the Director, California Service Center, and is now on appeal before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO). The appeal will be dismissed.

The petitioner is a citizen of the United States who seeks to classify the beneficiary, a native and citizen of the Philippines, as the fiancée of a United States citizen pursuant to section 101(a)(15)(K) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (the Act), 8 U.S.C. § 1101(a)(15)(K).

The director denied the petition after determining that the petitioner failed to establish that he and the beneficiary had met within the two-year period immediately preceding the filing of the petition, as required under section 214(d) of the Act or that such a meeting would have constituted an extreme hardship or violated the customs of the beneficiary's culture or social practice. *Decision of the Director*, dated August 17, 2007.

Section 101(a)(15)(K) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (the Act), 8 U.S.C. § 1101(a)(15)(K), provides nonimmigrant classification to an alien who:

- (i) is the fiancé(e) of a U.S. citizen and who seeks to enter the United States solely to conclude a valid marriage with that citizen within 90 days after admission;
- (ii) has concluded a valid marriage with a citizen of the United States who is the petitioner, is the beneficiary of a petition to accord a status under section 201(b)(2)(A)(i) that was filed under section 204 by the petitioner, and seeks to enter the United States to await the approval of such petition and the availability to the alien of an immigrant visa; or
- (iii) is the minor child of an alien described in clause (i) or (ii) and is accompanying, or following to join, the alien.

Section 214(d) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1184(d), states, in pertinent part, that a fiancé(e) petition:

. . . shall be approved only after satisfactory evidence is submitted by the petitioner to establish that the parties have previously met in person within two years before the date of filing the petition, have a bona fide intention to marry, and are legally able and actually willing to conclude a valid marriage in the United States within a period of ninety days after the alien's arrival. . . .

Pursuant to 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(k)(2), the petitioner may be exempted from this requirement for a meeting if it is established that compliance would:

- (1) result in extreme hardship to the petitioner; or
- (2) that compliance would violate strict and long-established customs of the beneficiary's foreign culture or social practice, as where marriages are traditionally arranged by the parents of the contracting parties and the prospective bride and groom are prohibited from meeting subsequent to the arrangement and prior to the wedding day. In addition to establishing that the required meeting would be a violation of custom or practice, the petitioner must also establish that any and all other aspects of the traditional arrangements have been or will be met in accordance with the custom or practice.

The regulation does not define what may constitute extreme hardship to the petitioner. Therefore, each claim of extreme hardship must be judged on a case-by-case basis taking into account the totality of the petitioner's circumstances. Generally, a director looks at whether the petitioner can demonstrate the existence of circumstances that are (1) not within the power of the petitioner to control or change, and (2) likely to last for a considerable duration or the duration cannot be determined with any degree of certainty.

The petitioner filed the Petition for Alien Fiancé(e) (Form I-129F) with Citizenship and Immigration Services on September 20, 2006. Therefore, the petitioner and the beneficiary were required to have met during the period that began on September 20, 2004 and ended on September 20, 2006.

At the time of filing, the petitioner indicated that he and the beneficiary had not previously met and that he was not able to travel outside the United States because he is on felony parole with the Utah Department of Corrections. *Form I-129*, dated September 16, 2006.

On appeal, the petitioner again states that he is on felony parole in the state of Utah and that he requested a travel permit from his parole officer. The petitioner states that his parole officer told him that he will not be allowed to leave the country while on parole and that his parole is indeterminate and could continue for his lifetime. *Form I-290B*, dated September 4, 2007. The record includes a letter from the petitioner's parole officer, which states that their office can never authorize the petitioner to leave the country under any circumstance. *Letter from Parole Officer*, dated August 28, 2007. The AAO notes that the record indicates that the petitioner is on parole for a first-degree felony conviction for aggravated sexual abuse of a child. *Record of Conviction*, dated April 22, 1991.

The AAO recognizes that because of the petitioner's parole requirements he cannot leave the United States. However, while section 214(d) of the Act requires the petitioner and the beneficiary to meet during the specified period, it does not require the petitioner to travel to the beneficiary's home country. The record on appeal does not demonstrate that the petitioner and the beneficiary explored options for a meeting beyond the petitioner traveling to the Philippines, including, but not limited to the beneficiary traveling to meet the petitioner in the United States. Therefore, the appeal will be dismissed.

The denial of the petition is without prejudice. After the petitioner and beneficiary have met, the petitioner may file a new I-129F petition on the beneficiary's behalf so that a new two-year meeting period will apply.

The burden of proof in these proceedings rests solely with the petitioner. Section 291 of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1361. The petitioner has not met that burden.

**ORDER:** The appeal is dismissed.